

Sunnyside Gold Corporation (SGC) Meeting
Draft Notes
Oct. 6, 2011, 2pm

Attendees:

Nathan Longenecker – VP and General Counsel SGC/Kinross, 1888 Sherman Street, Ste. 780
Denver, CO 80203 – phone: 775-829-1000; cell: 303-718-4508; email:
nathan.longenecker@kinross.com
Sabrina Forrest – EPA Assessment Program
David Ostrander – EPA PAR program
Richard Sisk – EPA Enforcement Program
Steve Wharton – EPA Remedial Program
Scott Wilder – EPA Enforcement Program

Purpose: Begin a dialogue related to the funds that SGC is ^{offering} committing to begin addressing the water quality problem.

SGC's Emphasis:

1. SGC is ^{offering} committing funds to begin to address water quality problem constructively with minimal transaction costs and believes local and cooperative solutions without Superfund would be in everyone's interest. *Would rather be spent on the ground vs fight and liability*
2. SGC is not married to a particular remedy.
3. Fundamentally SGC does not believe the contaminants are theirs and want to avoid court.
4. SGC understands that EPA/Superfund interest has been the impetus for this \$6.5 Million offer to the stakeholders and BLM. *other believe the CDW state*
5. SGC asked if listing is inevitable; EPA indicated that there are other ways to get work done, *water quality division provides liability* but to access significant resources, a listed site is needed.
6. SGC has no interest in mining in this region.
7. SGC does not know the specifics of what BLM may have in mind or the efforts they are undertaking. *back of the envelope calculations*
8. The \$6.5 Million was not scientifically based; SGC seemed open to the possibility that more money might be needed depending on what needs done.
9. SGC asked if we are committed to sending out 104(e) letters; we answered to the affirmative and discussed that we need more information to be able to better determine responsibility.
10. SGC indicated they are also researching other potentially responsible parties to bring to the table.

EPA's Emphasis:

1. Above all, EPA is also interested in water quality improvement.
2. EPA indicated to SGC that we are open to non-NPL options; however, if we are involved, CERCLA is the process we use. EPA later discussed that a process/framework is needed regardless of which entity leads the effort.
3. EPA primarily listened and asked questions around the above topics.
4. EPA and other stakeholders likely define "collaboration" differently.